

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 18, 2001 LB 598, 599, 691

to say about this amendment. But it...when you come into a bill like this that has this many substantial changes at this late date, I would hope that you would not support it. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Pedersen. Senator Jensen.

SENATOR JENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. As Senator Pedersen probably told you at the introduction of his bill, this is part of a \$10 million juvenile justice bill that's been...being proposed by the Governor. And it proposes both changes in legislative and budget initiatives over the next several years. It will coordinate juveniles' entry into the state system through this gatekeeper bill that we have before us. It will create a new General Fund aid program for counties, for...so that they can develop and sustain foster community-based programs for juvenile delinquents. Matter of fact, that has a fiscal impact of \$5,350,000. It will expand the array of services for juvenile offenders, including mental health, substance abuse treatment, through LB 691, that is also in line. That's a \$4,126,000 portion. And it will sustain substance abuse and mental health programs for juveniles committed to the youth rehabilitation and treatment centers, \$373,000. And then it will also provide for a program statement to transition an existing Department of Correctional Services secure facility to the Offices of Juvenile Services, to serve as a level 5 secure confinement facility. And that has...that's LB 599, and that has a \$150,000 impact. Senator Thompson has done a great job in juvenile services, not only here in the Legislature, but before she came to the Legislature. And I applaud her for that. But I think this amendment, however, which did not have a public hearing, really is a very, very large transition from what the bill was initially proposed. And if she would wish to bring this back next year and we can have a public hearing on it and discuss it, I think that would be absolutely proper. But I do have a little problem with the process when you bring an amendment to a bill that is so opposite of what the bill's intent really was. So I have a problem with that. And then also, LB 598 is just a part of a \$10 million package. So at this point in time, although I can understand where she's coming from, and I think there's some good things in her proposal, it is just not...it doesn't flow